

REMARKS

Claims 1-7 are now pending in the application. Applicant amends claims 1-7 herein. Support for the amendments claims can be found throughout the specification, claims and drawings as originally filed. For example, please see line 25 of page 1 to line 2 of page 2 and lines 6-7 of page 2 in the Specification, as well as Figs. 2B and 3A. Accordingly, no new matter is added. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

SPECIFICATION

The specification stands objected to for allegedly introducing new matter in the form of “a spatial area in which a playback signal of an audio frequency band of the ultrasonic speaker is reached”. Although Applicant does not necessarily agree with the Examiner’s objection, in the interest of clarification, Applicant amends claims 1-7 herein. Amended claims 1-7 contain no reference to the “spatial area” described above. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. This rejection is respectfully traversed. Notwithstanding Applicant’s traverse and solely in the interest of clarification, Applicant amends claims 1-7 to delete reference to “a spatial area in which a playback signal of an audio frequency band of the ultrasonic speaker is reached”. Instead, independent

claims 1 and 5, as currently amended, recite "a sound reproduction range of the ultrasonic speaker". Dependent claims 2, 3, 4, 6, and 7 as currently amended, recite a "sound reproduction range." Dependent claim 7 also recites a "sound reproduction range of each ultrasonic speaker." In addition, independent claims 1 and 5, as currently amended, disclose that "the sound reproduction range is a beam-shaped range in a direction of an axis of radiation from the ultrasonic speaker, in which a sound is likely to be reproduced from the ultrasonic speaker", among other characteristics.

The Specification mentions "the location where the sound is likely to be reproduced" (lines 6-7, page 2). Further, the Specification describes that "the reproduction range of the reproduced signal in the audible frequency range is a beam-shaped range in the direction of the axis of radiation from the ultrasonic transducer" (line 25, page 1- line 2, page 2). Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-7 are fully supported by the Specification, and therefore comply with the written description requirement. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Claims 1-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. In particular, the Office Action states that term the "spatial area" in claims 1-7 renders the claims indefinite. This rejection is respectfully traversed. Notwithstanding Applicant's traverse and solely in the interest of clarification, Applicant amends claims 1-7 to delete the term "spatial area" from claims 1-7, and has amended claims 1-7 for clarification. As described above, the amendments are

supported by the Specification. Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-7 comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

ARGUMENT

The Final Office Action dated February 16, 2010 rejected claims 1-2 and 4-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Onozawa (JP H11-095324A). The Final Office Action also rejected claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Onozawa in view of Matsuzawa et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2006/0033882 A1). Applicant has respectfully traversed these rejections, and filed its arguments on May 10, 2010. The present Office Action states that Applicant's arguments were considered but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection presently stated. Applicant maintains that claims 1-7 are novel and non-obvious in view of Onozawa and Matsuzawa, and respectfully requests reconsideration of the arguments submitted on May 10, 2010.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner

believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: November 2, 2010

By: /G. Gregory Schivley/
G. Gregory Schivley
Reg. No. 27,382
Bryant E. Wade
Reg. No. 40,344

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

GGs/BEW/pvd
15745271.1